

**From:** [PerezSullivan, Margot](#)  
**To:** [Goldmann, Elizabeth](#); [Brush, Jason](#); [Zito, Kelly](#); [Keener, Bill](#)  
**Cc:** [Leidy, Robert](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Oops - on bb did not notice memo attached, sorry! (Eom) Re: one more from Tony Davis  
**Date:** Thursday, November 21, 2013 8:30:31 PM

---

Just forwarded it.

Margot Perez-Sullivan

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

D: 415.947.4149 C: 415.412.1115 E:perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov

---

From: Goldmann, Elizabeth  
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 10:44:37 PM  
To: Brush, Jason; PerezSullivan, Margot; Zito, Kelly; Keener, Bill  
Cc: Leidy, Robert  
Subject: RE: Oops - on bb did not notice memo attached, sorry! (Eom) Re: one more from Tony Davis

Margot

Can you send the attachment or did you lose it?

-----Original Message-----

From: Brush, Jason  
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 6:56 PM  
To: PerezSullivan, Margot; Zito, Kelly; Keener, Bill  
Cc: Goldmann, Elizabeth; Leidy, Robert  
Subject: Oops - on bb did not notice memo attached, sorry! (Eom) Re: one more from Tony Davis

---

From: PerezSullivan, Margot  
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 6:39:47 PM  
To: Brush, Jason; Zito, Kelly; Keener, Bill  
Subject: Fw: one more from Tony Davis: FW: EPA Rosemont Mitigation Analysis

Can we confirm the pima county study was what we based our letter on?

Margot Perez-Sullivan

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

D: 415.947.4149 C: 415.412.1115 E:perezsullivan.margot@epa.gov

---

From: Davis, Tony <tdavis@azstarnet.com>  
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2013 7:39:23 PM  
To: PerezSullivan, Margot  
Subject: one more from Tony Davis: FW: EPA Rosemont Mitigation Analysis

Margot,

Pima County Administrator Chuck Huckelberry put out a memo today on your letter, and in it, he said that EPA's conclusions on the mine's impacts on groundwater flow are based on a study that was conducted for the county by Thomas Myers, a Nevada-based water consultant.

I'm not asking you to elaborate in any way on your letter—just to tell me if Huckelberry's memo is accurate on this one point.

Also, one substantive question on your Nov. 7 letter. On page 2 of the attachment that goes with that letter, it makes various references to indirect and secondary impacts on the mine on X or Y number of acres of Waters of the U.S.

Is there a difference, substantively or legally, between secondary and indirect impacts? Or are they talking about the same thing?

Thanks again and sincerely,

Tony Davis  
Arizona Daily Star  
520-349-0350 C  
520-806-7746 O

From: Deborah Haro <Deborah.Haro@pima.gov<<mailto:Deborah.Haro@pima.gov>>>  
Date: Thursday, November 21, 2013 at 11:55 AM  
To: Star User <tdavis@azstarnet.com<<mailto:tdavis@azstarnet.com>>>  
Subject: EPA Rosemont Mitigation Analysis

Hello Tony,

Please see the attached memorandum from Mr. Huckelberry regarding Rosemont Mine.

Thank you,  
Debbie

Deborah Haro  
Pima County Administrator's Office  
130 W. Congress Street, Floor 10  
Tucson, Arizona 85701  
Deborah.Haro@pima.gov<<mailto:Deborah.Haro@pima.gov>>  
520.724.8770

\*\*\*\*\* ATTACHMENT NOT DELIVERED \*\*\*\*\*

This Email message contained an attachment named  
image001.jpg  
which may be a computer program. This attached computer program could contain a computer virus  
which could cause harm to EPA's computers, network, and data. The attachment has been deleted.

This was done to limit the distribution of computer viruses introduced into the EPA network. EPA is  
deleting all computer program attachments sent from the Internet into the agency via Email.

If the message sender is known and the attachment was legitimate, you should contact the sender and  
request that they rename the file name extension and resend the Email with the renamed attachment.  
After receiving the revised Email, containing the renamed attachment, you can rename the file extension  
to its correct name.

For further information, please contact the EPA Call Center at  
(866) 411-4EPA (4372). The TDD number is (866) 489-4900.

\*\*\*\*\* ATTACHMENT NOT DELIVERED \*\*\*\*\*